

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. No claims have been amended, added or canceled. Thus, claims 28-56 are pending.

CONFERENCE REQUEST

The Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned to perform a telephone interview in the hope that this will allow an understanding to be reached about the recited embodiments. The undersigned believes that an appropriate amendment will result in prosecution conclusion since it is believed the issue is primarily one of appropriately reciting simultaneously displaying data in a single browser window in a way that illustrates how the recited browser operation differs from what is known.

35 USC §112

Claims 28-42 remain rejected under 35 USC §112 ¶2 as being indefinite. Applicant traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

It is respectfully submitted the Office misunderstands the technology and/or inventive intent for the recited embodiments and this has lead to a significant cost in time and resources for both Applicant and the Office. Although perhaps subtle to fully appreciate, as argued in previous responses, when a **conventional** browser is navigated, this results in the browser tearing down the current page and going to the new one. For example, displaying a page with frames and then pressing the "Back" button causes that page with frames to be destroyed. **There is nothing in the**

documents relied on by the office to prevent destroying the page with frames.

That is, there is nothing in the documents relied on that teaches the recited persistent data such that pressing the "Back" button results in only non-persistent data being replaced. The only way to get persistence with frames is to craft special links that explicitly say to load new data in a particular frame. Such web page programming **fails** in the face of a navigation such as by the "Back" button.

But, recited embodiments instead trap navigation attempts so that persistent data can be interleaved (if desired) with new data. This is done as discussed in the patent **without** having to tear down and rebuild resources associated with a currently displayed page as would be done **conventionally**.

Thus, as recited in claim 1, a browser first displays, "data in a display region" (e.g., a window region of the browser interface into which content may be presented) "of an information browser configured to selectively ignore attempts to navigate the browser away from said displaying the first data." This, for example, means that the recited browser need not permanently ignore all requests to navigate, it may be selective.

The recited browser may then display "data in the display region of the information browser, e.g., produce some output.

But, when the recited browser receives "a request operative to navigate the browser away from displaying the first and second data" unlike the destroy resources and navigate response that would be received from a **conventional** browser, the recited browser instead responds by replacing the "display of the first and second data in the display region with display of new data in the display region."

However, since the recited browser is selectively able to ignore navigation requests, e.g., let some data be replaced as requested, but ignore requests to replace data that is **persistent**, the recited browser instead may display "the first data and the new data in the display region of the information browser, wherein the first data persists in the information browser after said receiving the request.

The Office focuses on the language "operative to navigate the browser away from displaying the first and second data" as showing the claim elements are inconsistent with each other; Applicant submits this is simply an incorrect interpretation of the claims and the operation of the recited browser. That language refers to an action that **should cause the browser to navigate away**, such as pressing the backspace key on a keyboard, running program code that internally triggers the "Back" function, entering a new web page address in a browser's address bar, selecting a link from a "Favorites" list, pressing browser navigation buttons, etc., but in recited embodiments, does not because the browser is configured to **selectively ignore** such requests. As discussed in the specification and previous responses, many different actions may result in the request to navigate away; one significant difference between recited embodiments and a **conventional** browser is that persistent data will remain in the browser because as recited in the first clause, the browser is "configured to selectively ignore attempts to navigate the browser." Detailed arguments from previous responses is incorporated herein by reference.

35 USC §103(a)

Claims 28-54 remain rejected as being obvious over W3C "Implementing HTML Frames" in view of LaStrange (US Patent No. 5,784,058).

The fundamental problem with LaStrange is that LaStrange resolves its "persistence" by opening a NEW web page window (col. 1 lines 51-52). This is not what is claimed! **Applicant does not understand why the Office continues to fail to address this fundamental difference between LaStrange and what is claimed!**

Recited embodiments do **not** recite opening new windows to display new information; the Office is respectfully asked to explain how these new windows teach or suggest the recited embodiments. Detailed arguments from previous responses are incorporated herein by reference.

Conclusion

The documents relied on by the Office simply do NOT teach or suggest the recited persistence. Hence, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 28-56 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Regarding the remaining rejected claims not specifically discussed above, their rejections have **not** been substantively reviewed at this time in order to focus on the allowability of the independent claims and other claims specifically addressed above. However, it is submitted all non-discussed dependent claims are allowable for at least the reason of their depending from an allowable base claim.

Regarding the Office's reliance on the W3C frames, the Office is invited to load a web page with frames, and then type a new address in the address bar, such as for the New York Times newspaper. Unless an information browser is configured as in recited embodiments, those frames of the first web page will disappear and not persist. Thus, while one may program a frameset to load new data into only certain frames and leave other frames "static," *nothing* in such a frameset will prevent the typed address from resulting in the web page with frames being destroyed and new data from the Times web site displayed in its stead. And, there is *nothing* in the LaStange opening of a second window that will cure this fundamental deficiency of the W3C frames.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 19, 2005

/ Steven D. Yates # 42,242 /
Steven D. Yates
Patent Attorney
Intel Corporation
(503) 264-6589

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026